



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,352	11/08/2000	Joan D. Leonard	02108.0001U2	1597

7590
KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

12/02/2010

EXAMINER

FORD, VANESSA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/02/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3 _____
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES

6 _____
7 *Ex Parte* JOAN D. LEONARD, and ROBERT W. TULLY

8 _____
9 Appeal 2009-013864
10 Application 09/708,352
11 Technology Center 1600

12 _____
13 Oral Hearing Held: September 14, 2010

14 _____
15 Before ERIC B. GRIMES, FRANCISCO C. PRATS, and
16 JEFFREY N. FREDMAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

17 APPEARANCES:

18 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
19

20
21 JOSEPH A. COPPOLA, ESQUIRE
22 Kenyon & Kenyon
23 One Broadway
24 New York, New York 10004
25
26

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,
2 September 14, 2010, commencing at 9:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and
3 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Victor
4 Lindsay, a Notary Public.

5 THE USHER: Calendar Number 9, Appeal Number 2009-013864,
6 Mr. Joseph Coppola. The podium, sir.

7 MR. COPPOLA: Thank you.

8 JUDGE GRIMES: Good morning.

9 MR. COPPOLA: Good morning, Your Honors. Are we waiting --

10 JUDGE GRIMES: You can take your time --

11 MR. COPPOLA: I'm sorry.

12 JUDGE GRIMES: You can take your time getting set up there, and
13 when you get ready, you'll have 20 minutes to make your argument.

14 MR. COPPOLA: Thank you. Are we waiting for someone else?

15 JUDGE PRATS: No, we're not.

16 MR. COPPOLA: All right.

17 JUDGE PRATS: You're right, though. Sometimes the Examiners do
18 show up.

19 MR. COPPOLA: Okay. So I don't need to reserve any time for
20 rebuttal?

21 JUDGE PRATS: No.

22 MR. COPPOLA: Okay. Okay, I'm ready if everyone else is.

23 JUDGE GRIMES: Please, go ahead.

24 MR. COPPOLA: Good morning again. I'm Joe Coppola. I'm here
25 for the Appellants, and we're going to be talking about a case in which the
26

1 appealed claims are all directed to vaccines against *Mycoplasma bovis*,
2 which is a microorganism that infects cattle, causes diseases, and, in
3 particular, it causes a disease called mastitis, and mastitis is a disease of the
4 udders of cows. It causes lowered milk production and milk of poor quality
5 and it's a big problem in the dairy industry. Excuse me.

6 There are two rejections. There's an anticipation rejection and an
7 obviousness rejection, and we have argued in our Brief that the claims do
8 not stand and fall together for both rejections, and I'd like to go over some
9 of the limitations that we think distinguish the claims over the applied prior
10 art.

11 The anticipation rejection is over a Ph.D. thesis by someone named
12 *Boothby*, and we think that Claims 5, 6, and 54, which we argued separately
13 in the Brief, distinguish over *Boothby* because they recite --

14 JUDGE FREDMAN: Should it not be in Claim 1, the things that
15 they've agreed to?

16 MR. COPPOLA: Yes, but not for the reason that I'm going to go into
17 here.

18 JUDGE FREDMAN: Oh.

19 MR. COPPOLA: The limitations that are in Claims 5, 6, and 54 are
20 limitations directed to specific biotypes. Biotypes are defined in the
21 specification as -- on page 5, as variants or strains of *Mycoplasma bovis* that
22 can be distinguished by a particular characteristic, such as differences in
23 DNA sequence. The claims that I just mentioned, 5, 6, and 54, recite
24 Biotypes A, B, and C, which are biotypes that are isolated by the Inventors.
25 There are specific strains or variants of *Mycoplasma bovis*. The *Boothby*
26

1 thesis discloses a strain of *Mycoplasma bovis* called California 201. There's
2 nothing in the *Boothby* thesis that indicates that California 201 is either
3 Strain A, B or C. The *Boothby* thesis was published in 1982. Our
4 provisional was filed in 1999. The Inventors isolated Strains A, B, and C.
5 And there is a lot of evidence in the record which says that there are many,
6 many biotypes out there.

7 JUDGE FREDMAN: Well, one of the references indicated there were
8 37 different types.

9 MR. COPPOLA: Right. That's part of the evidence in the record. If
10 you put all that together, it's our opinion that the prima facie case of
11 obviousness has not been made for Claims 5, 6, and 54.

12 JUDGE PRATS: If I could refer you to page 13 of the specification,
13 it lists 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, about 10 strains. Are any of those California 201?

14 MR. COPPOLA: I don't believe so, but give me a moment, please, to
15 find the spec.

16 JUDGE PRATS: If you know.

17 MR. COPPOLA: Where is it? I'm very sorry. I thought I had it here.
18 I can't believe I don't.

19 JUDGE PRATS: That's okay. I'll just -- I'll rephrase it. Do you
20 know if California 201 is any of the -- is one of the strains that was tested by
21 the Inventors and disclosed in the specification?

22 MR. COPPOLA: We don't know that for sure, but it seems very
23 unlikely given how many strains are out there and the fact that the Inventors
24 isolated their own strains.

25

26

1 Okay, I'd like to move on to the next limitation, which is in Claims
2 29, 30, and 40 to 44. It's in other claims, but I should have said that the
3 anticipation rejection has only been applied to some of the appealed claims.
4 These claims, 29, 30, and 40 through 44, recite that the claimed vaccine
5 needs to be protective against mastitis. Now, the Examiner's Answer took
6 the position that that's an intended use. It's our position that rather than an
7 intended use, it's a functional limitation which distinguishes over *Boothby's*
8 vaccine.

9 JUDGE FREDMAN: But the Examiner has a vaccine which is --
10 would be due to the vaccine which is against the bovis. I don't think it tells
11 us whether it's effective against mastitis --

12 MR. COPPOLA: That's right.

13 JUDGE FREDMAN: -- but why would that not be apparent?

14 MR. COPPOLA: Right. The Examiner is using the inherency to find
15 this limitation.

16 JUDGE FREDMAN: Then why would that not be the case?

17 MR. COPPOLA: Because there is evidence in the record that
18 indicates that even though *Boothby* was published in '82, through the 90s
19 and 2001, people skilled in the art were treating -- were operating under the
20 assumption that a vaccine that's effective against -- that protects against
21 mastitis didn't -- wasn't available.

22 JUDGE FREDMAN: Well, but that doesn't really tell us anything
23 because for all we know *Boothby* had a patent himself and wasn't licensing
24 to anyone. I mean, there's no reason to assume specifically if *Boothby*
25 published something there was a -- it was necessarily an available vaccine.

26

1 What if people, for cost reasons or other reasons, chose to use it even if it
2 was available?

3 MR. COPPOLA: That is possible.

4 JUDGE FREDMAN: I mean, I don't think that just negative evidence
5 that the dog didn't bark at night proves your point.

6 MR. COPPOLA: I understand that --

7 JUDGE FREDMAN: Do you have any positive evidence --

8 MR. COPPOLA: None of these references make a clear statement
9 that no vaccine was available --

10 JUDGE FREDMAN: And the burden --

11 MR. COPPOLA: -- but it seems to us it's a reasonable inference.

12 JUDGE FREDMAN: Right, but the burden under *In Re Best* (ph.), is
13 shifted to you, I think reasonably, by this Examiner. He has shifted the
14 burdens and I have an inherent reference. It's vaccine. It raises, you know,
15 immune response. It apparently seems to work. Why it wouldn't protect, I
16 think, then becomes your burden.

17 MR. COPPOLA: Well, it's -- when you said it appears to work, that's
18 against respiratory diseases which are very different from mastitis, which is
19 a disease of the udder. *Boothby* was --

20 JUDGE FREDMAN: I understand, but he has a working vaccine and
21 I think that the burden then shifts. We don't have a lab, or the Examiner
22 certainly doesn't have a lab.

23 MR. COPPOLA: I'm sorry, the Examiner doesn't?

24 JUDGE FREDMAN: Doesn't have a laboratory, right?

25 MR. COPPOLA: Oh, yes. Right. I understand.

26

1 JUDGE FREDMAN: That's the whole reasoning under *Best*, that the
2 Patent Office can't test it themselves.

3 MR. COPPOLA: I understand.

4 JUDGE GRIMES: Do you -- is there any evidence in the record of
5 other references where they've tried particular vaccines against this
6 bacterium and it didn't work to prevent mastitis?

7 MR. COPPOLA: There is, and that's part of the evidence in the
8 record. There's another paper by -- a scientific paper by *Boothby*. We
9 assume it's the same *Boothby*. It seems to be the same investigator, and
10 that's *Boothby II* in the evidence of record.

11 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay. Can we see that?

12 JUDGE GRIMES: And what does that show?

13 MR. COPPOLA: It shows that a vaccine, which seems to be very
14 similar to the one in *Boothby's* Ph.D. thesis, couldn't do much against
15 mastitis. In that paper, *Boothby* and his coauthors treated cows with killed
16 *Mycoplasma bovis* and then challenged them with infectious *Mycoplasma*
17 *bovis*, and what they found was that, on the whole, it's our opinion that
18 giving the killed -- if I call it a vaccine -- giving the killed microorganisms
19 led to worse outcomes. There's a figure in that paper on Figure 2 which
20 we've reproduced in our Reply that says -- or it shows that the worst
21 outcome in terms of milk production came from the cows that were
22 vaccinated.

23 JUDGE PRATS: All right, doesn't the Examiner take issue with this?
24 The Examiner -- you all are butting heads on this issue. You're saying, well,
25 milk production went down, but the Examiner says -- as disclosed in the
26

1 abstract and elsewhere in his article, it says that, in fact, by the end of the
2 study no m-bovis could be recovered from challenged quarters on
3 vaccinating cows and that milk appeared mostly normal. So the Examiner is
4 saying if you can't find the bug on the udders, then that shows that this
5 actually was effective.

6 MR. COPPOLA: Okay, two things about that. First of all, it says by
7 the end of the study, and that, to our mind, is an indication that eventually
8 the cows recovered, which even if they get sick they do recover from
9 mastitis eventually. I -- we think that's what happened.

10 The second thing is that there's a lot of -- there are a lot of things
11 measured in this paper. Some of them seem to be a little better for the
12 control cows but, in our opinion, most of them seem to indicate that the
13 vaccinated cows did worse. And I'd like to read something -- oh, excuse
14 me. I have a problem in that I need these for distance but not for close-up
15 viewing, so I need to --

16 JUDGE PRATS: I'm just the opposite. We're all getting older.

17 MR. COPPOLA: I guess maybe you need to change too back and
18 forth.

19 Anyway, on page 202, right column, last paragraph of this *Boothby II*,
20 all experimentally challenged quarters developed CMT reactivity. CMT
21 reactivity is a test to show that there is *Mycoplasma bovis* present. So all
22 experimentally challenged quarters means that every udder that was given
23 live m-bovis became infected, so the vaccine didn't protect. Then it goes on
24 to say all challenged quarters on vaccinated cows remained CMT positive
25 for the duration of this study, while some challenged quarters on control
26

1 cows became CMT negative. So, there, you have a disclosure which
2 indicates that the control cows, the cows that didn't get the killed m-bovis,
3 did better than the vaccinated cows. And that's what I mean by most of the
4 evidence in this paper, to our reading at least, indicates that the vaccine
5 didn't work. And again, this was by the author of *Boothby I*.

6 JUDGE FREDMAN: Do we know that it's the same vaccine or --

7 MR. COPPOLA: We don't, no. It appears to have -- there's very
8 sketchy --

9 JUDGE FREDMAN: Is it the very same organism?

10 MR. COPPOLA: I think it was California 201.

11 JUDGE FREDMAN: It says here, it says California 201. Okay.

12 MR. COPPOLA: Yes. And there are very few details about how it
13 was prepared and how it was grown and so on, but given the little detail
14 that's there, it seems very similar to what was in the *Boothby* thesis.

15 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay.

16 MR. COPPOLA: If there are no more questions about this issue, this
17 limitation, I'd like to move on.

18 Okay, Claims 52 and 55 recite the *Markush* group of certain
19 adjuvants, and the Examiner's Answer -- we're back to anticipation and
20 *Boothby* -- the Examiner said that *Boothby I*, the *Boothby* thesis, discloses
21 aluminum hydroxide and for that reason meets these claims, meets that
22 *Markush* group. But if you look at the *Markush* group, what it actually says
23 is aluminum hydroxide oil emulsion, which is not the same as just aluminum
24 hydroxide. And if you look at the *Boothby* thesis, it discloses that the

25

26

1 aluminum hydroxide was present in an aqueous solution. So we're asking
2 that you withdraw this rejection of Claims 52 and 55 for that reason.

3 JUDGE PRATS: I'm sorry, I missed this -- that argument, where it is
4 in your Brief.

5 MR. COPPOLA: Oh, I believe it's there. It would probably be
6 towards the end of the discussion on anticipation. Here's the missing
7 specification. Excuse me. Do you know how much time I've used?

8 JUDGE GRIMES: We'll let you go beyond your 20 minutes since
9 we're asking questions.

10 MR. COPPOLA: Oh, well, thank you.

11 JUDGE GRIMES: And can you lift things up --

12 MR. COPPOLA: Okay, page 18 --

13 JUDGE FREDMAN: Of the Brief?

14 MR. COPPOLA: Yeah. We pointed to a list of adjuvants -- in the
15 Brief, we pointed to a list of adjuvants and said it doesn't disclose, and none
16 of these adjuvants are the adjuvants in the *Markush* group. Then in the
17 Examiner's Answer, the Examiner said, hey, what about aluminum
18 hydroxide? And then in our Reply, we said it's not -- I think we addressed
19 it. Maybe we didn't. But at any rate, it is in the Brief. The claims are
20 argued separately on page 18. Anything else on the issue of adjuvants?
21 Okay, if there are no more questions about anticipation, I'd like to move on
22 to obviousness.

23 JUDGE FREDMAN: Well, you didn't really address Claim 1,
24 though. Do you have any arguments from Claim 1 or --

25

26

1 MR. COPPOLA: No, I wasn't prepared to talk about that. I had to
2 decide what I could fit into the 20 minutes and --

3 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. COPPOLA: I don't want to say I'm withdrawing it --

5 JUDGE FREDMAN: That's fine.

6 MR. COPPOLA: -- but I don't want to address it.

7 JUDGE FREDMAN: Sure. I understand.

8 MR. COPPOLA: Thanks. Okay, for obviousness, we have Claims 8
9 through 12, 31 through 39, and 46 through 51 that we argued separately, and
10 as a subset of those claims, Claims 34 through 39 and 46 through 51, which
11 we also argued separately, both of those subsets of claims, or both of those
12 groups of claims recite at least two biotypes. For the second group of
13 claims, 34 to 39 and 46 to 51, the two biotypes must be distinguished by
14 DNA or RNA sequence, genetically different --

15 JUDGE FREDMAN: Aren't any two biotypes going to necessary be
16 distinguished by DNA sequence? That is, if they're antigenically different
17 in any way, at least the antigen itself will have to have at least a DNA
18 difference or you won't -- at looks to me that way. So isn't that kind of an
19 almost necessary property? It's almost impossible not to have that active?

20 MR. COPPOLA: Well, you could have DNA sequence differences
21 that don't show up antigenically. You know, they could be for rivasolarene
22 (ph.) --

23 JUDGE FREDMAN: Right.

24 MR. COPPOLA: -- or something that generally doesn't raise an
25 immune response.

26

1 JUDGE FREDMAN: But the reference is -- I think the reference
2 teaches these in two different ones, right? I mean, so the question is it's hard
3 for them to have a reference teaching two different antigens that are not
4 significantly different. Right here, I see that you could have, you know,
5 even ones that are antigenically the same but different in the DNA, but it'd
6 be hard to be antigenically different and not be different in the DNA.

7 MR. COPPOLA: Okay, I see what you're saying. I -- that sounds
8 right on first hearing to me, yes.

9 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay.

10 MR. COPPOLA: The key reference for this group of claims of
11 *Poumarat*, which is a publication that studied the isolation of 37 different m-
12 bovines and was able to group those m-bovines into what are called 13
13 genomic groups. *Poumarat* looked at the DNA by restriction enzyme
14 analysis and found certain patterns and some of the isolates have the same
15 patterning equivalent in one group. Other isolates had a different pattern if
16 you'd put them in another genomic group. After doing that, *Poumarat*
17 looked at the antigenicity, the antigenic variability, as he called it, of the
18 different genomic groups. Excuse me for a moment. And this may be my
19 most important point here. *Poumarat* found when he looked at the antigenic
20 variability of the genomic groups, when he looked at strains within one
21 genomic group, they had a lot of antigenic variability and the antigenic
22 variability within groups, *Poumarat* said, was equal to the antigenic
23 variability when you compare groups, and what that says to -- we have a
24 quote from page 318 in our Brief in which *Poumarat* makes statements to
25 that effect. What that says to us is that one of ordinary skill in the art
26

1 looking at those statements would say, well, I'm going to make a vaccine.
2 I'd like antigenic variability in my vaccine because that will give me a
3 broader scope of protection but, according to *Poumarat*, I'd get all of that
4 antigenic variability by using one genomic group. It -- there's cost time
5 expense involved in using more than one genomic group. You have to -- if
6 you're just going from one to two, you double all of those things, the cost,
7 the time, and the expense, that are associated with preparing the group, the
8 biotype for the vaccine. So looking at all of that, one of ordinary skill in the
9 art would say why would I use two? I'm better off using one. It's simply
10 cheaper. It'd give me the same effect. I'd be deterred from using two.

11 JUDGE FREDMAN: Doesn't the very last, at page 319 of *Poumarat*,
12 the very last paragraph, pretty much say that two highly variable antigenic
13 systems have been identified so far for m-bovis, but their individual function
14 was not known? So given that there's two antigenic systems, wouldn't you
15 pick two?

16 MR. COPPOLA: I don't think so. That's a little different from what I
17 was talking about. That paragraph refers to the work with monoclonal
18 antibodies which, I think you know, focus on one protein.

19 JUDGE FREDMAN: Right.

20 MR. COPPOLA: What he found was that for some monoclonal
21 antibodies a membrane antigen appeared to be in two different states.

22 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay.

23 MR. COPPOLA: But there's nothing in *Poumarat* which indicates --
24 you probably would want to hit both of those states in your vaccine, but
25 there's nothing in *Poumarat* that indicates you need to have two genomic
26

1 groups to do that because the variability is the same within, even for this
2 presumably, although *Poumarat* doesn't address it specifically. Presumably,
3 for this type of variability, it's the same within the group as it is across the
4 groups.

5 JUDGE GRIMES: So as I understand it, your argument is that
6 *Poumarat*'s genomic groups correspond to the biotypes that are recited in
7 the claims?

8 MR. COPPOLA: Yes, especially Claims 34 to 39 and 46 to 51
9 because --

10 JUDGE GRIMES: But your specification has a very broad definition
11 of biotypes.

12 MR. COPPOLA: It does, yes.

13 JUDGE GRIMES: It just requires some kind of DNA difference?

14 MR. COPPOLA: Right.

15 JUDGE GRIMES: And as Judge Fredman was saying, if you've got
16 an antigenic difference between two strains, even if they're within the same
17 genomic group, it would seem likely, if not certain, that there's a DNA
18 difference behind that antigenic difference?

19 MR. COPPOLA: That's right.

20 JUDGE GRIMES: So why do we have to go to different genomic
21 groups to get different biotypes?

22 MR. COPPOLA: Well, you don't -- you do for Claims 34 to 39 and
23 46 to 51 because biotypes in those claims is restricted. Along the same lines
24 as *Poumarat* --

25

26

1 JUDGE GRIMES: Counsel, I'm sorry. Explain that. I'm looking at
2 Claim 34. It says that at least two inactivated or attenuated *Mycoplasma*
3 *bovis* biotypes are genetically different as determined by an analysis of DNA
4 or RNA from the biotypes. So why doesn't that just require some kind of
5 DNA sequence difference between the two types of m-*bovis*?

6 MR. COPPOLA: I think it does.

7 JUDGE GRIMES: Okay. And why -- in *Poumarat*, within a single
8 genomic group, if you have antigenically different microorganisms in there,
9 why would you expect that they would not have a DNA difference?

10 MR. COPPOLA: I think I see your point. I guess they would. I think
11 I see your point. I wish I had more time to think about it. This is the first
12 time it's come up during prosecution. Could we maybe remand for that if
13 you find that's a reason to sustain or to make a new rejection, perhaps, a new
14 argument?

15 JUDGE GRIMES: I think we'll have to see how our thinking comes
16 out after this argument.

17 MR. COPPOLA: Just please consider that. It is the first time we've
18 heard that. It hasn't come up. Okay, that's probably all I have to say about
19 that issue.

20 The next issue, the next set of limitations is, again, protection against
21 mastitis, and that's Claims 29, 30, and 40 to 45. And this an obviousness
22 rejection and it looks to us as though *Boothby II*, that is, the *Canadian*
23 *Journal of Veterinary Medicine* article, teaches away from that limitation. It
24 shows failure of others, and, again, our reading of that publication is that on
25
26

1 the whole it pretty clearly indicates that the vaccinated cows did worse.

2 That would deter someone from trying to repeat it.

3 JUDGE GRIMES: Okay, I think we've covered that particular issue.

4 MR. COPPOLA: Right. The last thing I have to talk about is Claim

5 56, which is an -- it requires an attenuated *Mycoplasma bovis*, and there is

6 nothing -- the only one of the three references used to support the

7 obviousness rejection that has anything to do with attenuated m-bovis is

8 *Thorns* (ph.) and that at the very end has a statement which indicates that at

9 least the authors of *Thorns* felt that what was disclosed in *Thorns* were not

10 vaccines, that they could perhaps lead to production of vaccines, that's, you

11 know, with more work being done, so --

12 JUDGE FREDMAN: With the attenuated variance, I mean, that's --

13 an ordinary artisan knows that one can attenuate a virus for vaccines. You

14 know, it's a pretty standard procedure since the original rabies vaccine. All

15 right, so --

16 MR. COPPOLA: Right. Well, yes. For the most part, that's true,

17 yes.

18 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay.

19 MR. COPPOLA: I have nothing else unless you have further

20 questions.

21 JUDGE FREDMAN: Okay.

22 JUDGE PRATS: I have nothing.

23 MR. COPPOLA: Okay.

24 JUDGE GRIMES: Thank you for coming in.

25 MR. COPPOLA: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity.

26

1 Whereupon, the proceedings, at 9:25 a.m., were concluded.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26